HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 49 Saturday, December 7, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

TRAGEDY BACKSTAGE: *How Ike really looks* (page 1)

NATO CONFERENCE: *Publicity stunt?* (page 1)

JENNER QUITS: *The inside story* (page 2)

KENNAN: *Apostle of appeasement* (page 3)

FULTON LEWIS: *Progress report* (page 4)

Cotton-Wool Capital: "Journalists, formerly noted for writing more than they really knew, now know more than they write" — so cracks one cynical observer in a Washington bathed in an atmosphere of synthetic discretion.

Why a fuller story of what goes on does not reach most of the public prints is something that springs from — among other things — sympathy with the tragic figure in the White House, who tries groggily to get back on his feet; a desire "not to rock the boat"; and journalistic caution (waiting for things to crystallize, *etc.*). Since the race with Russia hangs in the balance, these reticences could add up to disastrous discretion.

Therefore, HUMAN EVENTS offers some information (gathered from reliable sources present) about what took place at the closed-door conference between the President, Executive leaders and wheel horses of Congress on December 3.

● *President's Health.* Eisenhower looked well, in so far as physical appearance was an index. However, as the back-and-forth of questions and answers and general discussion proceeded, members of Congress became disturbed.

When the President spoke, he articulated very slowly and what he said was not always intelligible. Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams kept repeating, "What the President means . . ." Ike seemed to have some difficulty in following the various statements and arguments and would indicate that he wanted the answers repeated. This occurred quite a number of times.

● *Budget.* The figure of $2 to $4 billion additionally needed defense funds was prominently mentioned in headlines. But many present had the distinct impression — from statements by Defense Secretary McElroy and others of the Executive — that such new sums would be largely offset by cuts in other parts of the Defense Department budget.

● *Weapons Race.* Democratic members afterwards talked of the "lack of urgency" in the Administration attitude towards pushing the missiles program and bolstering air power. Members of both parties were disturbed by a feeling that the Executive regarded the scientific race — particularly as regards the Sputnik — as "something out of a space thriller" and therefore to be minimized. Special Presidential Assistant Robert Cutler, himself an unsuccessful novelist, particularly manifested this attitude.

● *NATO.* The forthcoming meeting at Paris of NATO received a glowing build-up from the Executive assistants. Sherman Adams spoke of it as the "most momentous meeting in history," and stressed the necessity of the President's going to Paris, emphasizing that Eisenhower "enjoyed enormous prestige as a result of his victory in 1945."

It may or may not be true — but members of Congress present talked of it during and afterwards: that Ike, resting at his farm in Gettysburg last week end, did not want to return to Washington for the congressional conference; but Adams, it is said, "made him come back."

Democratic Senators openly — and some Republicans privately — expressed the opinion that there should be no NATO conference at all. "It's just a public relations stunt; Adams' idea to bolster the prestige of the President and to keep him in the Presidential chair" — such was the tendency of many remarks. It was noticeable that Dulles did not chime in with Adams in the latter's enthusiasm for the Paris meeting. The State Department, it is known, feels that nothing constructive will come out of a NATO conference now.

● *India.* One Senator questioned Dulles closely on foreign nonmilitary aid, and the Secretary of State said the Administration would ask Congress to vote $150 million of such aid a year for five years for India. The Senator remarked behind his hand to a colleague: "I wouldn't give India 150 million cents."

● *Treaties.* Senators let Dulles know quite definitely that he should not make any executive agreements with foreign heads at the NATO meeting. They underlined the constitutional principle that any and all agreements reached at Paris must be passed upon by the Senate. "We don't want any more Yaltas and Teherans," was their vigorous warning. Dulles hastened to agree.

● *Comic Relief.* One exchange brought laughter. Dulles said we could trust Premier Macmillan of Britain, when we placed missiles and missile installations in the United Kingdom, because "Harold won't prevent us from firing."

One congressional member raised the question that if "Appeasement" Aneurin Bevan, leftist Laborite leader, came to power as Foreign Secretary, he might not prove so accommodating to our plans to resist Soviet Russia. Dulles replied that Bevan would acquire a "sense of responsibility" if he became Premier. Everyone looked at "Appeasement" Adlai Stevenson and laughed. The mirth from the Southern Democrats was rather harsh. Adlai did not laugh but sat in silence, his face red with anger.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● *Post-Mortem.* Afterwards, Democratic members went into a huddle behind closed doors. As reported to HUMAN EVENTS, the various reactions were primed by the recollection of some recent history — a remembrance of Yalta and Teheran. And not merely the memory of the secret diplomacy which time has discredited. Also recalled was how the fast-failing Roosevelt was "shored up" by his Palace Guard, run through the 1944 election campaign (although friends knew he was a dying man) and then sent to Yalta where he surrendered the fruits of victory. Again, the interpolation of Sherman Adams came to mind: "What the President means . . ."

All thought that Nixon should take over as President; "for the good of the country," although not all like the Vice President. One said, "We can't afford a part-time President; we need not merely a *full-time* President, but an *overtime* President — working 18 hours a day."

Jenner: The word in Indianapolis political quarters — according to HUMAN EVENTS correspondents there — is that Senator William E. Jenner (who this week announced his departure from the Senate) will not retire from politics, but will run for Governor. It is well known in Indianapolis that Jenner has long nourished an ambition to take over the State House, and he leaves the Senate at the height of his political power in the Hoosier state. In the past two years, he has routed the "modern" wing of his party — now discredited, largely as a result of its involvement in highway scandals. Jenner's hand-picked successor appears to be Governor Harold Handley, a conservative leader in the GOP, whom Jenner "made."

Every confidence is expressed that Jenner will make the Governor a Senator come next year's election. Then — it is expected — the ex-Senator will launch a campaign for his own election as Governor in order to protect Hoosierdom from the influence and inroads of the Federal Government. For Jenner, the expanding centralized Government in Washington remains the principal enemy to free Americans.

This chart of Jenner's plans — taken seriously in Indianapolis — may offer one reason why Jenner surprised the state and Nation by bowing out, just when victory in re-election seemed "in the bag."

Another reason is the "personal" one mentioned in press reports. That refers to the beautiful Mrs. Jenner. The Senator's hatred for encroaching Federal power is only matched by his wife's detestation of the social atmosphere of the Capital. For her, it is an atmosphere of left-wing catch-words and small talk, of schools where "liberal" teachers of her son do not conceal their dislike for the policies of her husband.

Mrs. Jenner proves to be an exception to the rule that most congressional wives like the social attractions — the parties, dressing for dinner, display and snobbery — all too well for their husbands' careers. For most, life's principal ambition is to get asked to this or that well-publicized salon, to be invited to the White House for dinner, to be admitted to the Georgetown Garden Club, *etc.* In short — "Potomac Fever."

Jenner's lady prefers a quiet life, devoted to her household and a few close congenial friends — preferably of the conservative Hoosier variety. When her husband took to heart the GOP leadership's abandonment of party traditions and its drift into "modern Republicanism" — not to mention his mourning for two dead friends, McCarthy and Welker — Mrs. Jenner did not exactly discourage his desire to depart from the Washington scene.

Split Democrats: The gulf that yawns between Southern (mostly conservative) Democrats on the one hand and Northern "liberal" Democrats on the other was sharply evident among the leaders of that party who gathered for the White House conference this week. For in addition to the Democratic congressional hierarchy, there was present twice-defeated Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson, titular leader of the party.

What precisely swayed Adlai to say that he would not go to the NATO conference in Paris remains a subject of some argument in Democratic circles. But most observers say that his negative decision arose mainly from his disappointment with Administration proposals for foreign nonmilitary aid. At the White House conference, Dulles said the Administration would ask Congress to approve an increase of $500 million a year in foreign nonmilitary aid. Adlai wants "massive foreign aid," literally running into billions a year. The defeated Democratic candidate thus ran true to form — as in his last campaign for election — minimizing military aid and emphasizing international boondoggling.

His fellow Democrats from the South took a sharply different attitude. They wanted increases in military spending and deprecated the kind of aid Stevenson desired. Senator Russell said the additional sums of US military spending (such as for missiles) should be obtained by cutting down proportionately the nonmilitary aid sent abroad. "The most important thing to the free world today," he said, "is for us to regain superiority in the weapons field. It is the only thing that guarantees the free world against Soviet attacks."

Raymond Moley's article, "Conservative Victory — How to Achieve It," in this issue, tells what YOU can do to offset the swollen political power of the labor bosses. After reading this article, why not make a list of all the people you know who can profit by reading such an analysis? Then mail a reprint to each of them.

Mitchell: Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, whose pro-union fawnings have become increasingly irksome to congressional Republicans (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 23 and November 30, 1957), is off on another tack aimed at "buttering up" union bosses. This one is his sponsorship, apparently successful, of John Fanning, now a labor relations expert with the Defense Department, for membership on the National Labor Relations Board. Fanning would succeed Abe Murdock, Democratic holdover member and former New Deal Representative from Utah, whose term expires December 16.

Employer groups generally object to Fanning's prospective designation, contending that in every instance in which he has tried to settle a labor-management dispute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on behalf of the Defense Department, he has invariably bespoken views far over on the union side. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks has joined the efforts to get the appointment for a less partisan candidate. But an employer representative who discussed the matter with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams quotes the latter as saying it had been decided (apparently by Adams) that the job should go to a Democratic friend of labor, and that Fanning met the requirements.

Mitchell in recent weeks has become more obeisant than ever toward the bosses. A suspicion is growing that the reason may be an illusion in his mind that by so doing he might win their support for the New Jersey Senate seat which Senator H. Alexander Smith is vacating next year. Mitchell unquestionably would like the seat; the consensus of observers, however, is that the union bosses will support whoever gets the nod from newly re-elected Democratic Governor Robert Meyner. The New Jersey union bosses would dearly love to put Meyner in the White House.

Civil Rights: The resignation of former Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed from the Chairmanship of the new "Civil Rights Commission" stirs knowing comment among Capital news analysts. Reed's statement of declination — that he felt there would be a conflict if a member of the judiciary (he is still available to hear cases on the Federal bench) should accept a position in the Executive branch — is viewed as commendable, but is discounted. Other reasons, Washingtonians speculate, may have impelled Reed to withdraw.

Although he was a member of the Court that handed down the May 17, 1954 ruling on school segregation, it is recalled that Reed is a native of Kentucky. Many believe he was one of the Justices reportedly "dragged along" by arguments that unanimity was imperative, and by the granting of certain concessions in the wording of the decision.

It is known, moreover, that Reed has been in violent disagreement with many of the stands taken by the present Court. For example, he delivered a blistering dissent to the notorious *Nelson* decision of April 2, 1956, which he characterized as an unwarranted invasion of states' rights.

In a recent California speech concerning the "civil rights decisions of the Supreme Court," Reed made the pointed comment that "the overruling of constitutional decisions when their error becomes apparent is essential" (see HUMAN EVENTS for October 19, 1957).

Kennan: Washingtonians are sifting with some amazement the recent utterances from England of George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow. The architect of American foreign policy under the Truman regime is delivering a series of lectures at Oxford University. In his address last week Kennan tied together an exhortation to NATO to reject atomic missiles proffered by the US and the idea that America should negotiate the "neutralization" of West Germany with the Communists.

The "neutralization" proposal, it is pointed out, is not new. Kennan previously advanced the idea that both Germany and Japan should become "neutral" zones in a speech in Pittsburgh, May 3, 1956 (this was the speech in which he also said that there was "a finality, for better or worse," about Communist regimes in Europe). Former Ambassador William C. Bullitt afterwards commented on Kennan's proposal: "Nothing could better suit the Soviet Government's purpose to weaken the Western World."

Kennan's tack on atomic arms, however, is a recent addition to his list of policy suggestions. His warning against the acceptance of atomic arms by NATO followed by one week a similar admonition from Communist boss Nikita Khrushchev. In an interview with William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Khrushchev stated: ". . . remember, your overseas bases are yours, but they are surrounded by the peoples of those countries. You will see, one day they will awaken from their slumber and recognize the folly of depending on NATO and such alliances for their protection."

***Daily Worker* foreign columnist A. B. Magill called attention to the fact that both Walter Lippmann and Eleanor Roosevelt were in harmony with Kennan's ideas on Germany. "Kennan, Lippmann and Mrs. Roosevelt," said Magill, "are right."**

● Recent propaganda blasts from Moscow, and other left-wing sources, have been aimed at frightening America's allies into policies of appeasement and pacifism. Left-wingers in the British Parliament last week raised a cry over the fact that American planes based in England carried hydrogen bombs. Prime Minister Macmillan had to take to the floor of Commons to quell the rising hysteria. In his Hearst interview, Khrushchev had already introduced the idea of a hypothetical "mad" US pilot who might streak for Moscow and unload an atom bomb, thus supposedly touching off World War III. After the Parliamentary debate, the Soviet Army newspaper *Red Star* announced to the British that they faced "guaranteed death" from Red missiles if "mad" SAC pilots should atomize Soviet targets.

These pronouncements, say Washington analysts of Red propaganda, mean that Moscow is badly frightened of SAC. US strategy of keeping planes loaded with nuclear weapons aloft around the clock reportedly has "infuriated" the men in the Kremlin (see HUMAN EVENTS *for November 16, 1957).*

Oppenheimer: The campaign to secure reinstatement of atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer, declared a security risk in 1954, continues to pick up momentum. Statements from such as Trevor Gardner and Senator Clinton Anderson (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 30, 1957) find confirmation in the pronouncements of Senator Jacob Javits and former AEC Commissioner Thomas Murray. Javits last week said that, if the Government did not have information additional to that which originally caused Oppenheimer's dismissal, it should reinstate the scientist forthwith. Murray has been quoted as saying that he would have "no objection" to reopening Oppenheimer's case, and that "I would not be at all displeased if he were reinstated."

It is recalled with some astonishment that among the Atomic Energy Commissioners who originally de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cided to dismiss Oppenheimer, Murray was the most vigorous in his criticisms of the physicist. An American citizen, Murray commented at the time, should recognize "that his Government, because it is lawful, has the right and the responsibility to protect itself against the action of those who would subvert it. The cooperative effort of the citizen with the rightful action of American Government in its discharge of this primary responsibility also belongs to the very substance of American loyalty."

"Dr. Oppenheimer," Murray added, "occupied a position of paramount importance; his relation to security interests of the United States was the most intimate possible one. It was reasonable to expect that he would manifest the measure of cooperation appropriate to his responsibilities. He did not do so."

Murray concluded his opinion by saying: "It was reasonable to expect that Oppenheimer would be particularly scrupulous in his fidelity to security regulations. These regulations are the special test of the loyalty of the American citizen who serves his Government in the sensitive area of the Atomic Energy program. Dr. Oppenheimer did not meet the decisive test. He was disloyal."

Program for Businessmen: Antagonisms within and related to the production process cut America's ability to produce by about 20 per cent; thus because the public does not fully understand the role of business, the country loses around $80 billion annually — such were the startling conclusions voiced in a recent Washington speech by Lemuel C. Boulware, Vice President of the General Electric Company, and author of the HUMAN EVENTS article, "What Businessmen can do to Combat the Foes of Business" (February 2, 1957).

Speaking before a meeting of the Public Utilities Advertising Association at the Mayflower, Boulware declared that people like the service businessmen perform, but that "they go out of their way to prevent us from doing it." In order to counteract forces hostile to them, Boulware said, businessmen must acquire "new political sophistication." "We must learn who among our public servants is good," he said, "and who is bad. And we must help the good ones be free to do what they would like to do, and prevent bad ones from doing what they would like." (For an explanation of the steps by which businessmen may best follow this suggestion, see "Conservative Victory—How to Achieve It," by Raymond Moley, in Article Section of this issue.)

Friends of Fulton Lewis: The drive by the Committee of Friends of Fulton Lewis to keep that commentator on the air has made, it appears, much progress. When the campaign started 3 weeks ago, the Lewis program had 71 sponsors, many of them part-time. Since then, 40 part-time and 15 full-time sponsors have been acquired. The result brings a new financial picture — the Mutual Broadcasting System (which carries the Lewis program) has been taking a big loss: this loss has been cut from $1400 a week to $550 a week. *The Friends of Fulton Lewis stress, however, that much remains to be done if the broadcast is to stay on the 300 stations, mostly "sustaining," which now carry it. Only a fraction receive substantial revenue for transmitting the program.*

The Committee acknowledges with gratification the large number of letters received from listeners of the Lewis broadcasts, and wishes to answer two questions frequently raised in these letters:

(1) *Wouldn't it be easier to get one sponsor for the whole Nation?* Answer — Single sponsorship would endanger Fulton's independence as a commentator. The pressure groups opposing his utterances would concentrate their fire on that one firm. It is easier to intimidate a single sponsor than several hundred.

(2) *Can you release a list of sponsors who have dropped Fulton so that we can boycott them?* Answer — Fulton is firmly opposed to any such action. It is not always possible to determine with precision just why any one firm has dropped Fulton. Some firms may do so simply because they cannot afford to advertise in all markets at the same time and may therefore decide for purely business reasons to transfer their advertising to some other medium.

On the positive side, the Committee urges listeners to redouble their efforts to obtain sponsors. They can, for instance, form groups to call upon prospective sponsors to urge them to take on the Lewis broadcasts. Also, listeners can help by writing letters to the stations now carrying his program without sponsorship; they can say that they will, if possible, buy the products of any advertiser who assumes the sponsorship. (Station KORE in Eugene, Oregon, for example, received 381 letters and cards promising to buy from a Fulton Lewis sponsor.) This would spur the station to obtain a sponsor. The station salesmen will take these letters to show to prospective sponsors.

DR. and MRS. WALTER F. SCHWARTZ, Pasadena, Calif.: "We used to send fruit baskets, etc., to our doctor friends who through professional courtesy cared for our children during the year. Now, we send them HUMAN EVENTS — and give them something really 'meaty' to digest. Your written words save us many hours of talking and we are most grateful for your excellent reporting of current events and trends."

* * *

YOU, TOO, CAN SOLVE YOUR CHRISTMAS GIFT PROBLEM.

IN 20 MINUTES you can write the names and addresses of friends to whom you want to send HUMAN EVENTS as a Christmas gift.

Two or more three-month subscriptions, $2.50 each; two or more six-month subscriptions, $5 each; two or more annual subscriptions, $9 each.

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 49 HUMAN EVENTS December 7, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

CONSERVATIVE VICTORY—HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

(Second of two articles)

By RAYMOND MOLEY

Contributing Editor, *Newsweek*

THE GREAT MASS of Americans, including members of all unions, are conservative, peaceful people — working, earning what we can, enjoying what we may, and being what we ought to be in the eyes of our neighbors. The community — not the clan, or the union, or the Chamber of Commerce or the employers' association — the community is still the essential group in our society. In the community there must be virile and unselfish leadership, especially in political affairs.

That leadership should come from those whose training and occupation has to do with management, organization and the communication of ideas. It is obvious that business, large and small, has just that sort of talent. It is to those who have that talent that I am making this appeal.

I am not making an appeal for a businessman's movement as such. There are already plenty of people who are willing to lead some of us, but pathetically few who can lead all of us. *The businessman who may be moved to offer his time and energy and means to political activity should do so as a member of the whole community. He is not going to help if he merely sets up another interest group in opposition to the interest group that I described in last week's article.*

The politically aware businessman must be concerned with all elements in the American community, and essentially with the kind of political parties and Government that truly represent all elements. He must be interested in good, sound and — in the best sense of the word — conservative Government.

I can best illustrate what I mean by citing a few examples. In one great midwestern city in 1946 a number of officers of smallish industrial concerns decided to do something about a Congressman who had been imposed upon them for many years. They got together, pooled their money and brains, made a tentative working arrangement with one of the party organizations, employed a staff — partly full-time and professional — mobilized a force of volunteers, trained them, and moved into the city blocks and apartment houses in search of sympathetic voters. The efforts of this group resulted in turning a 40,000 majority against them into a 40,000 majority for their candidate. Since then this citizens' organization has moved into other Congressional Districts and has also worked for better representation in the state legislature. Only the fixed policy of this group to maintain anonymity deters me from describing it at greater length and detail.

In Ohio, especially in Cleveland and some smaller cities, groups of citizen-leaders were sprung into action in 1950 by the challenge of William Green, the head of the AFL, who said in a speech before the Ohio Federation of Labor: "Cost what it may, let it be what it will, we're going to bring about the defeat of Senator Taft . . . . We'll beat Taft with money."

The group in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County mobilized a force of 2000 volunteer precinct workers, established a cordial relationship with the regular Republican organization and went to work. The results justified the effort and in succeeding elections the same group has maintained its efforts with distinct success.

Another such citizens' organization is the Republican Associates of Los Angeles. It operates in the open. Its membership includes many important business and professional men and women. Its operation is on a year-around basis. It consists of research, the training and direction of volunteers, and of programs designed to induce junior-college teachers and students and others to take a more active part in politics. It also maintains means to support friendly members of Congress at home while they are serving in Washington.

Conservative Leaders: Who They Are, How They Function

I could mention other instances of aroused and effective citizens' efforts in politics. I regret that I could also cite instances in which leadership was aroused, but lacked the know-how and started too late to be effective. By "leadership," *I mean the efforts of all those who are fortunate enough to have the skills essential to organize and to influence others, and who also have the means through which their personal influence can be communicated to others.*

- *Specifically* — I mean men and women concerned with business management. People who know the techniques of efficient use of means and manpower. For politics, as it has been traditionally practiced, is one of the most wasteful and inefficient of human activities.
- *Specifically* — I mean those engaged in selling goods and services. There are millions of them, and they are selling the American people not only all that they need, but also a lot that they don't need. Only in selling good government are they impotent, ineffective, neglectful. But they have political leadership's basic asset — many, many contacts. And the secret of effective political action is contacts, contacts and still more contacts.
- *Specifically* — I mean all sorts of people whose callings involve communication with others. For example: doctors, insurance agents, lawyers, teachers.
- *Specifically and most important*— women, whose patience, idealism, and willingness to work at the sometimes tiresome tasks so essential in politics can be most important.

I SHALL ATTEMPT to simplify what I have learned about leadership and organizing, during my experience in politics, in terms of *seven principles of organization.*

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. A question frequently asked is: Should the individual who is willing to give his time and effort go into the established party organization, or work toward creating political auxiliaries? Heaven knows that party organizations need recruits, and I would be the last to discourage such participation. The fact is, however, that millions of sleeping voters are unwilling to respond to the appeal of a political party as such. I believe that they are wrong and that their abstention from politics is basically what is the matter with the parties. But we are dealing here with what is, not what ought to be. So, *I believe that political action of the kind I am describing should be directed towards creating active auxiliary groups to work with and for, but not in, a party organization.*

2. Such groups need have no name, or else they might take a completely innocuous one. *If members know their objectives and know each other, no formal name or organization is necessary.* In fact, the group I have mentioned which has been operating in a great midwestern city has never had a name or formal organization.

Relationship to Parties

3. Such groups are created to work for the election of a candidate or for the slate of a party. *So far as the Republican or Democratic party is concerned, the choice will depend upon the place, the party's ideology and the character of the candidate.*

(I am avoiding the word "independent" here. It is a cruelly abused word. It connotes a certain contemptuous attitude toward parties and politics and a quite undeserved claim to distinction and virtue. There may be genuine independents, but most who claim the name are either timorous creatures afraid to take a stand, or unable to arrive at a decision. They have votes, however, and they need leadership.)

4. Citizens' action outside the party must, above all, act in harmony with the legally constituted party organization whose candidates it wants to aid. Professional politicians are in the main excellent people. They give time and energy and no inconsiderable talent to the arduous tasks of keeping a party alive. They take the abuse of the opposition and of the press with stoical patience. They properly resent interference with their real and proper prerogatives. They have a prejudice against amateurism. And they detest anyone who is likely to cut in on their scanty and irregular income from voluntary contributions.

The auxiliary is there to help, not to dictate. If there are honors to be attained in this business or bows to be taken, the professionals should be allowed them. Never put them in a secondary role. Hell hath no music like a politician playing second fiddle.

Where Effort Is Most Needed

5. I believe I have said enough at this point to make clear that the preservation of liberty and the integrity of our free institutions depend mainly upon the law-making bodies in the states and the nation. *Auxiliary help should be directed toward the election of the right kind of Congressmen, Senators, Governors, and members of state legislatures.*

Citizens' organizations should not spread their energies and means too thin. There will, in the future as in the past, be plenty of organizations such as Citizens for Eisenhower, or Dewey, or Willkie, or Roosevelt, or Truman, or Stevenson. *It is the forgotten members of Congress and the state legislatures who need help.* The vast disparity between the size of the vote in a year like 1954 and that in a year like 1956 proves this point. As I pointed out last week, the political arms of the unions concentrate on legislators.

6. I am convinced, after a great deal of thought over a period of years, that *auxiliary groups should be local rather than national.* The creation of a national group with "a habitation and a name," with offices in Washington and all that, merely provides the opposition with a convenient target. It has been the observation of more than one Democratic candidate over the country that endorsement by such an organization as the ADA does more harm than good. *Carrying the general message of the necessity for more and more citizens' action may well be left to established national organizations, but the action should be local.*

7. The area in which a group should work must depend upon circumstances to be evaluated in each individual case. *It may be as wide as a Congressional District or a big city, or as narrow as a city block or an apartment house.* A bit of wisdom from Theodore Roosevelt might be the guide: **"Do what you can, with what you have, where you are."** We must never forget that elections are won at the level of the precinct, the township or the city block. They are won or lost on the doorsteps of America.

THE INSTINCT of a politician in office is to do what he can to stay there. This instinct may well prevail over the rational processes which determine his attitude toward a given piece of legislation. Hence an appeal to vote for or against a measure comes with vastly greater force when it carries with it some evidence that the people or organizations interested have some capacity to help or injure him in his home District or state.

Never was this lesson more cogently brought home to me than in a conversation I had last year with a Congressman. I told him that I was called upon occasionally to offer advice to businessmen concerning their political responsibilities and I asked him what I ought to tell them.

"Tell them," he replied, "that when they or their representatives come before a Congressional committee supporting or opposing some pending measure, that despite the validity of their argument and the excellence of their way of expressing it, the mind of the committee member constantly goes back to his basic problem as a political office holder. *What,* he says to himself, *can this individual or organization do for me in the next election? What did he do for me in the last election? What is he or his organization doing now for me back home to defend me against the efforts of my enemies and rivals?* He always knows when Meany, or Reuther or some other labor leader is there that his question answers itself: *They have done, and are doing and can do plenty. If I vote their way they will not forget. They will not leave me, naked to mine enemies, at home."*

I am not underestimating the importance to business and professional people of having intelligent and persuasive lobbies to represent their interests and keep them informed. But I suggest that to a greater degree, as the political forces of the unions tend to concentrate on local, precinct work, *the battleground is where the lawmakers, not the laws, are made.*

A Nine-Point Program for Action

I now suggest some principles of action, based upon the experience of many citizens' groups:

1. Business and professional men and women are altogether prone to limit their political commitments to polite applause for conservative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speeches and writings and to modest financial contributions to their favored parties and candidates. They are like some church members, who will kneel down for their faith but will not stand up for it. The fight for economic liberty cannot be won by the timid, noncommittal and inactive. *Political action must be for someone and against someone.* Citizens' action must be militant.

2. The origins of successful citizens' movements have been small directing groups of dedicated and responsible men and women. Such a group, meeting frequently, forms policy and directs activities. *This responsibility is not something that presidents of companies can delegate to the fifteenth assistant vice president.* It requires people who are accustomed to the direction of large and important affairs. **Businessmen who cannot spare time for this from their business may some day have no business at all.**

3. I distinctly favor professional management under the directing board. That is the rule in the reconstructed Conservative party in Britain. Every consideration demands it: capacity to organize, tact, articulateness, and willingness to work. *A rich field for the recruiting of such professional year-around talent is among retired business or professional people, army and navy officers, and others.*

4. A major job of the professional must be the training of volunteers. Britain has schools for training political workers. A crying need in the United States is a school for politics combining training of professional workers and research. This is a suggestion for someone who wants to do the most with a bequest.

5. Citizens' activities such as I suggest cannot enjoy the advantage of thousands of captive workers such as are available to the AFL-CIO COPE. It must depend upon volunteers, giving of what time they can spare, freely, for a cause in which they believe. As Ruth Miller, a professional political worker in New York, puts it: "Our job demands toil, sweat and volunteers."

6. Professional leadership in citizens' activities requires great resourcefulness in spurring the interest of volunteers. These volunteers must realize the usefulness of their work. There must be inspired in them a sense of mission, vigor, enthusiasm, and teamwork within the group. Here the prestige of the top organizers of the movement can be usefully employed. It can mean a lot for the lesser lights in a company and a community to enjoy comradeship with the big bosses. *The idea I want to convey is that some of the camaraderie of the traditional office party is essential—without the liquor and the lipstick, of course.* In Cleveland the heads of great corporations give real time to work in the precincts, side by side with the volunteers.

Personal Contacts Essential

7. There must be rewards. *Victory or near-victory dinners, picnics and other forms of entertainment after elections and on occasion through the year are necessary.* Letters of thanks, appreciation, and encouragement should go out in quantities from the "big shots" on the directing board.

8. Much has been said in recent years, for and against, about "Madison Avenue" in political campaigns. It is true that, to a degree unprecedented in politics, the Republican party has utilized the professional services of advertising and public relations firms in merchandising its policies and candidates. Since in their commercial work these firms use the facilities of radio, television, and the printed word on a bountiful scale, such instrumentalities have a large part in the promotion of the national and the state tickets.

I shall not attempt to evaluate these devices in relation to what they cost, except to say that *such generalized appeals are, in politics, always secondary to the personal contacts made in precinct work.* The Madison Avenue sower who goes out to scatter his seed must count on half of it being wasted on the convinced opposition, and another considerable amount falling among the weeds and thistles of the unheeding. When good and fertile ground is reached, the voters there are already convinced and need but the prodding necessary to get them to vote and register. Appeals by television, radio, and the printing press are like strategic bombing; they weaken and prepare the way. But the soldier on foot is essential to the capture and occupation.

9. Contacts with the press present to any citizens' group an exacting and enduring problem. This requires professional management. The press, I hardly need say, is interested in the unusual, and such citizens' activity outside the party is a deviation from traditional political routine. But as I have made clear, the citizens' group should avoid publicity for itself as much as possible. It must permit the legally constituted organization and the candidates to have the footlights. Moreover, reporters have a way of prodding top businessmen with searching, not to say uncomfortable, questions.

The press must not be lured by the appearance of secrecy or irritated by sharp refusals and denials. A considerable proportion of the working press have political convictions quite removed from those of citizens' groups such as I am describing. Perhaps frankness is the best policy: "Yes, we are working for Candidate X. We are helping with volunteers, and we are working in friendly fashion with the party which nominated X. Just doing our duty as citizens, as Americans should. Old stuff, just like those other Americans who are working against X. Not much news. Pretty routine."

THE VOTE is the payoff. All the energy, money and ingenuity that go into the campaign are in vain if the voter does not get to the polls. *Here is a lesson which may be hard for an American to learn:* ***very few people are converted in a political campaign.*** *The most experienced and successful political strategists, such as Roosevelt and Flynn and the people who run the AFL-CIO COPE, don't bother with the opposition.* They get the margin of votes necessary among those who are favorable prospects but are normally too lazy and indifferent to vote. *The market for votes is among the sympathetic but apathetic.*

The Lessons of British Conservatism

British experience in recent years offers several lessons in politics. The 1950 election marked a great comeback for the Conservative party. It almost won control of the House of Commons. The Labor party held on with a small margin until 1951, when the Conservatives won a clear mandate. In 1955 their majority was increased to more than 60.

I learned a great deal from my observations of the methods of both British parties:

1. The paid, full time Conservative constituency agent is the key to the successful comeback of the party. Ideological considerations were important because the grand design of socialism had failed miserably in its first test. The Labor slogan "Fair Shares," in practice, meant sharing scarcity and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

austerity. *But it took hard work at the local level to mobilize the indignant middle class and get it to the polls.* This was the job of more than 600 Conservative agents.

2. Those agents are trained. *The Conservative party maintains educational means for this.* When a prospective agent has qualified in these training schools and courses he is given a certificate which he proudly displays in his office.

3. A great source of talent for recruiting agents is among retired officers of the military services. One of the best that I saw was a retired Brigadier. These people know how to manage volunteers, organize committees, and deal with the indispensable paper work.

4. There are regional agents whose jurisdiction may be 50 or 60 constituencies. These have advisory duties only. The agent is accountable to party headquarters in Abbey House, London.

5. Campaign literature and other essential material is sent out from party headquarters. Incidentally, the Conservative Book Store in Abbey House has a rich line of literature for sale.

6. The agent's job between elections is to keep his party alive in the constituency. He must maintain committees and keep them occupied, find things for volunteers to do, get up entertainments and the like — not only to cement the relations of the volunteers to the party but to raise money for its support. He must carefully maintain lists of voters with all necessary information concerning them.

7. In the short British campaign period — about three weeks — every effort is directed toward combing out the vote for the candidate. This means not only identified members of the party but sympathetic prospects. There must be attention to the postal vote for absentees. Means of conveyance must be provided where necessary.

8. British political activity is amazingly economical. Not only is there a strict limit on expenditures, but — with the income tax what it is — the "take" from voluntary sources is limited.

The activities of the Labor party are not unlike those of the Conservatives. Most of the financial support comes from trade unions. But since 1945 the Labor organization has deteriorated. Labor had only about half of the number of full-time constituency agents that were employed by the Conservatives.

The battle in a parliamentary election is really a contest between the two organizations to see which can get out the largest proportion of its potential vote. Since the Conservative party in 1955 was well equipped for that, it won the election. In my judgment the issues were secondary to organization efficiency.

IN *How to Keep Our Liberty* (Knopf), a book published early in 1952, I said: "Above all, citizen action should waste no time speculating about or hoping for a Presidential Moses to lead us out of the wilderness." I was thinking at the time of the great demand over the land that General Eisenhower run for the Presidency. I had no doubt about the crying need for a new regime headed either by Senator Taft or General Eisenhower. But I felt deeply that no individual could be a permanent solution . . . not even an authentic Moses. And there was also the chance that the man elected might not prove to be an authentic Moses.

I was not surprised that millions felt — after having elected Eisenhower — that all would be well. After the great crusade of 1952 millions who had voted in 1952 sat out the Congressional elections in 1954. The effect of that mass abstention enabled a well-organized minority to move into selected states and Districts and to tip the balance in Congress.

In 1956 there was another great turnout. But COPE, following the same tactics that had prevailed in 1948, abandoned Stevenson and made further gains in Congress. Actually, the formation of organizations such as Democrats-for-Eisenhower was a direct hint to split the ticket. Above all, we now have the incontrovertible evidence that the "coattail" theory no longer applies in Presidential elections. A repetition of the experience of 1954 now threatens in 1958. The returns may be shattering news.

Complacency Helps the Left

There are plenty of people who feel that some of us are overestimating the power of the unions in politics. They think that we are over-alarmed in noting the danger of a class party. In fact, that is exactly what a publication of the UAW said about me. It said that I was "seeing things under the bed."

Such reactions may also be expected from conservative quarters. The normal state of affairs will return, say complacent businessmen, and a reaction will set in. They also say that the revelations of the McClellan Committee have so discredited some union leaders that they will have no more influence. They blithely overlook the fact that the McClellan revelations have concerned political matters in a very slight degree only. There are powerful forces in the committee and in the Senate that are perfectly willing to limit the investigation to a few mobsters and lovers of luxury. To reveal the extent of political power is an entirely different matter.

To all who suffer from complacency I would suggest the lesson of the Frenchman who decided to ignore the French Revolution. The issue I have described is real, it is immediate and it cannot safely be ignored.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "CONSERVATIVE VICTORY — HOW TO ACHIEVE IT," at $.....

Send me.....reprints of last week's article, "THE BIG ROADBLOCK TO CONSERVATIVE VICTORY," at $.....

Send me.....sets of both articles at $..... (See special rates below.)

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of a single 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Additional copies of both articles purchased as a set: single set, 30¢; 10 sets, $1.50; 25 sets, $3; 100 sets, $7.50; 500 sets, $30; 1,000 sets, $45. In 5,000 lots, $35 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name .....

Street.....

City .....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED